11/20/70

Dear Tom,

Because I do not believe you misrepresented the Archives' phone call to you, I assume whoever misrepresented it to you had some purpose not immediately obvious to me. However, it is apparent from the language and the purpose of my letter, which I read to you, that I did not say - have a copy of the memo of transfer and that the letter is a formal appeal, as required by their regulations, in an effort to get a copy of the memo, with attachments.

I know there is some exchange between the various agencies involved in these matters. My own experiences do not persuade me that in all cases everything is exchanged with everyone who might be involved.

In preparation for a number of legal actions, I started the considerable task of indexing my correspondence. It is not up to date. However, the dates of my correspondence on this may at some time be of interest to you.

I made an initial, blanket request, verbally, of Dr. Rahmer, about 11/1 or 11/2/66, at the time the transfer (of which I had known) was publicized. I thereafter made verbal request at the time the Clark panel report was made public. (In this connection, Mr. Goff might want to read American Mail v Gulick) Letters were exchanged thereafter

1966: 2/28;3/23;4/4;4/5;4/7;5/27;7/14;8/15;10/31;11/4;
1970: 3/13;4/24 (subsequent ones not indexed).

With Justice:

1969: 3/30;4/6;7/10;8/29)others not indexed). I have carried the appeal through all prescribed channels at Justice and the Attorney General has denied me.

On Monday I filed a petition and motion in Civil Action No. 718-70, asking that something be done about what I believe is both contempt and perjury by Justice. When they lie under oath to a federal judge, I can, I think, anticipate the character of their more private conferences.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg